

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wopto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/024,691 | 12/17/2001 | Richard Joseph Caballero | SBL0020US | 2964 | |
| 60975 CAMPBELL | 7590 11/18/2009 STEPHENSON LLP | EXAM | EXAMINER | | |
| 11401 CENTU | JRY OAKS TERRACE | CHENCINSKI, SIEGFRIED E | | | |
| BLDG. H, SU AUSTIN, TX | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 3695 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 11/18/2009 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| •• | | |
| 10/024,691 | CABALLERO ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| SIEGFRIED E. CHENCINSKI | 3695 | |
| | | |

| | SIEGFRIED E. CHENCINSKI | 3695 | |
|--|--|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 04 November 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS | APPLICATION IN CONDITION F | OR ALLOWANCE. | |
| \(\text{\$\tinx{\$\text{\$\texitext{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\tex{ | the same day as filing a Notice of A eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed v | Appeal. To avoid abar i, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | date of the final rejection | n. |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | | FIRST REPLY WAS FIL | .ED WITHIN TW |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of thes set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| AMENDMENTS | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t They raise new issues that would require further cor They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | sideration and/or search (see NOT | | cause |
| They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or | er form for appeal by materially rec | lucing or simplifying th | ne issues for |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | orresponding number of finally reje | cted claims. | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | |
| The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | mpliant Amendment (F | PTOL-324). |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | imely filed amendmer | t canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | be entered and an ex | planation of |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-63</u> . | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but | hadaan ayaa dha data addiina Alla | | ha antonial |
| because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | sufficient reasons why the affidavi | t or other evidence is | necessary and |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | l and/or appellant fails e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1) | s to provide a |
| The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | of the status of the claims after er | itry is below or attache | ed. |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☑ Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| | /Narayanswamy Subra Primary Examiner, Art U | | |

Continuation of 13. Other: : upon reviewing Applicant's After-Final submission, made up of amendments to the claims and arguments, the amendments and arguments do not establish clear evidence of allowability as required by the MPEP.

The MPEP generally discourages the reopening of prosecution once prosecution is closed through the issuance of a final rejection. The MPEP has a relatively high bar for an examiner's withdrawal of the finality of prosecution once it is closed through a final rejection, limiting such reopening of prosecution to clear evidence of allowability if such evidence were to come to the examiner in a timely manner upon the issuance of a final rejection. These guidelines are explained by MPEP 706.07(e) Withdrawal of Final Rejection, General. "See MPEP § 714.12 for amendments after final rejection. Although it is permissible to withdraw a final rejection for the purpose of entering a new ground of rejection, this practice is to be limited to situations where a new reference either fully meets at least one claim or meets it except for differences which are shown to be completely obvious".